

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNIRAM TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

No. C 04-1268 VRW (MEJ)

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

**ORDER RE TSMC'S U.S. PATENT  
NUMBERS '638, '186, '050, AND '226**

MONOLITHIC SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY,  
INC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed August 29, 2006. (Doc. #231). In the letter, plaintiff UniRAM Technology, Inc. ("UniRAM") seeks to compel defendant Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. ("TSMC") to produce documents related to the conception, including initial invention disclosures and inventor notebooks, of the inventions disclosed and claimed in TSMC's U.S. Patent Numbers 6,136,638 ("'638"), 6,600,186 ("'186"), 6,661,050 ("'050"), and 6,420,226 ("'226"). UniRAM argues these documents are relevant to its trade secret misappropriation claims and may also entitle it to an equitable assignment of the patents. In response, TSMC argues that UniRAM's request is not only burdensome, but that UniRAM's theory of relevancy is highly-attenuated.

Upon review of the parties' letter, the Court finds that UniRAM's request is at least relevant to its trade secret misappropriation claims. Further, given that TSMC has over 3,700 issued U.S. Patents and over 1,700 pending U.S. patent applications, discovery regarding four of its patents is not burdensome. However, UniRAM sets forth the relevancy of the '638 Patent as an example, but

1 does not address the '186, '050, and '226 patents in the joint letter. Accordingly, TSMC need only  
2 produce documents related to the '638 Patent at this time. If UniRAM continues to seek discovery  
3 related to the remaining three patents, it shall file a letter showing the relevancy of those patents.  
4 TSMC may file any objections to UniRAM's request within five days of UniRAM filing its letter.  
5 TSMC shall not repeat any arguments raised in the August 29 joint letter; rather, it shall only  
6 address relevancy as it relates to the three requested patents.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8  
9 Dated: September 11, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA ELENA JAMES  
United States Magistrate Judge